



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/053,954

01/24/2002

Kevin F. Dudley

10399

5959

7590

04/01/2005

William F. White
Carrier Corporation
P.O. Box 4800
Syracuse, NY 13221

EXAMINER

SWARTHOUT, BRENT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2636

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. **10/053,954**

Applicant(s)

DUDLEY, KEVIN F.

Examiner

Brent A Swarthout

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

a. Claims 1-9, 30,33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kitamura et al.

Kitamura discloses a air conditioned providing system comprising providing entry of a comfort level at plural data entry devices (Fig. 13), collecting the entered data and determining an overall comfort level for a group of entry devices (col.8, lines 33-42), transmitting an overall comfort level indication to an air conditioning system and modifying conditioned air when the overall comfort level of a particular value is received (col.15, lines 5-12; col.20, lines 54-67).

Regarding claim 2, Kitamura discloses menu (Fig. 13).

Regarding claim 4, Kitamura discloses use of personal computer 101 (Fig. 11).

Regarding claim 6, Kitamura teaches summing numerical values of comfort level (col.3, lines 25-29; col.8, lines 33-44).

Regarding claim 7, each data entry device has a unique identifier (Figure 14).

Regarding claim 9, Kitamura teaches storage of comfort level values (col.13, line 65-col.14, line3).

Regarding claims 30, 33 and 34, each input location has a unique identifier for that location (col.21, lines 20-23).

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

b. Claims 10-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura et al in view of Kline et al.

Kitamura discloses an overall comfort level air conditioned modifying system as set forth above, except for specifically stating that the heating and cooling system was a HVAC system.

Kline teaches use of a well-known HVAC system for heating and air conditioning.

It would have been obvious to use a HVAC system to provide air conditioning/heating in a system as disclosed by Kitamura, in order that the overall comfort level could have been provided with existing heating and cooling systems.

Regarding claim 12, since entered comfort level by an individual is sent via electronic mail (col.20, lines 43-48), the local computer would have stored the entered value as sent mail.

3. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura et al. in view of Ahmed.

Kitamura discloses a user input temperature control system as set forth above, except for specifically stating that data from sensors at a particular location are used to control temperature.

Ahmed teaches desirability of controlling temperature conditions at a particular location amongst plural locations by inputting user feedback including the relevant area of a building (col.5, lines 1-14).

It would have been obvious to control a particular location's temperature out of a plurality of locations as taught by Ahmed in conjunction with a system as disclosed by Kitamura, in order that different places could have had different temperature control, based on the user feedback at each location, thus providing more comfortable conditions for people in a given area.

4. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what claims 31 and 32 are meant to depend on, since it is improper for the claims to depend on themselves. No further examination of these claims is possible until dependency is corrected.

5. Regarding applicant's remarks filed 11-22-04, on page 12 applicant states that comfort for only one location is provided. However, as clearly depicted in Fig. 1, comfort is provided for at least the two different cubicles shown in the Figure.

On page 12 it is stated that no unique identifier is used, but Kitamura clearly teaches that unique identifiers are used (col. 22, line 11).

On page 12 it is stated that no threshold is used to assign comfort level. However, Kitamura clearly discloses that based on calculated index value "thresholds", a temperature is assigned (col. 20, line 61- col.21, line 3; col.24, lines 23-46).


6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent A Swarthout whose telephone number is 571-272-2979. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Hofsass, can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Brent A Swarthout
Examiner
Art Unit 2636

**BRENT A. SWARTHOUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**